## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-21 are pending. Claims 1-6, 13, 17 and 20 are amended. No new matter has been introduced. Reexamination and reconsideration of the present application are respectfully requested.

In the November 03, 2004 Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 17 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but indicated that it would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants thank the Examiner and have rewritten claim 17 in independent form, slightly amended to improve form. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 17 is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, and 4-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by Momii et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,052,665 (hereinafter Momii). (November 03 Office Action, page 2) The Examiner rejected claims 2, 6, 11-13 and 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Momii in view of Murphy, U.S. Patent No. 5,921,035 (hereinafter Murphy). (November 03 Office Action, page 6) The Examiner rejected claims 7 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Momii in view of Murphy and in further view of Flannagan et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,008,376 (hereinafter Flannagan). (November 03 Office Action, page 12) The Examiner rejected claims 8-10 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Momii in view of Murphy in view of Flannagan and in further view of Asayama, U.S. Patent No. 5,784,467 (hereinafter Asayama). (November 03 Office Action, page 13) The Examiner rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Momii in view of Murphy and in further view of Shimauchi et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,661,813 (hereinafter Shimauchi). (November 03 Office Action, page 16) The Examiner rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Momii in view of Murphy and in further

view of Miyahira et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,321,848 (hereinafter Asayama). (November 03 Office Action, page 13) Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections in view of the claims as amended.

## Independent claim 1, as amended, now recites:

A picked-up-sound reproducing method for picking up a sound present in a first sound field and reproducing the picked-up sound in a second sound field, said picked-up-sound reproducing method comprising:

detecting a sound pressure present in said first sound field and a sound pressure reproduced in said second sound field; and

adjusting a sound pressure to be reproduced in said second sound field so that the sound pressure present in said first sound field and the sound pressure to be reproduced in said second sound field assume a predetermined relationship, wherein the sound pressure present in said first sound field is used as a reference value in adjusting the sound pressure to be reproduced in said second sound field.

The Momii reference does not disclose, teach or suggest the method specified in independent claim 1, as amended. Unlike the method specified in independent claim 1, as amended, Momii does not teach a method including "adjusting a sound pressure to be reproduced in said second sound field so that the sound pressure present in said first sound field and the sound pressure to be reproduced in said second sound field assume a predetermined relationship, wherein the sound pressure present in said first sound field is used as a reference value in adjusting the sound pressure to be reproduced in said second sound field." Instead, the Momii reference is directed to a technique for eliminating the difference in transmitted sound levels at respective terminals to realize a television conference system which does not cause a sense of disorder. (Momii; Abstract and Col. 1, lines 7-10 and 60-67) Momii discloses that transmitted sound levels from a plurality of terminals are adjusted to be equalized at the same level and the reproducing side adjusts the transmitted sound level

disregarding the sound pressure level of the transmitting side. (Momii; Col. 8, lines 13-24)

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, as amended distinguishes over the Momii reference.

Claims 2-4, 6 and 13, all as amended, recite similar limitations to independent claim 1, as amended. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-4, 6, and 13 distinguish over Momii for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, as amended.

Claim 5 depends from independent claim 3, as amended. Claims 7-12 and 21 depend from claim 6, as amended and claims 14-16 and 18-20 depend from claim 13 as amended.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3, 7-12, 14-16 and 18-21 distinguish over Momii for the same reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 3, 6, and 13.

With respect to claims 2, 6, 7, 11-14 and 18-21, the Murphy reference does not make up for the deficiencies of Momii. The Examiner utilizes Murphy to show a two-way communication means including combination speaker/microphone unit installed on a wall. (November 03 Office Action, page 7) However the combination of Momii and Murphy does not disclose a method including "adjusting a sound pressure to be reproduced in said second sound field so that the sound pressure present in said first sound field and the sound pressure to be reproduced in said second sound field assume a predetermined relationship, wherein the sound pressure present in said first sound field is used as a reference value in adjusting the sound pressure to be reproduced in said second sound field." Accordingly Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 6, 7, 11-14 and 18-21 distinguish over Momii in combination with Murphy.

With respect to claims 7-10 and 14-16, the Flannagan reference does not make up for the deficiencies of Momii and Murphy. The Examiner utilizes Flannagan to show a loudspeaking teleconferencing circuit having a plurality of processing channels. (November 03 Office Action, page 12) However, the combination of Momii, Murphy and Flannagan does not disclose a method including "adjusting a sound pressure to be reproduced in said second sound field so that the sound pressure present in said first sound field and the sound pressure to be reproduced in said second sound field assume a predetermined relationship, wherein the sound pressure present in said first sound field is used as a reference value in adjusting the sound pressure to be reproduced in said second sound field." Accordingly Applicants respectfully submit that claims 7-10 and 14-16 distinguish over Momii in combination with Murphy and Flannagan.

With respect to claims 8-10 and 15-16 the Asayama reference does not make up for the deficiencies of Momii, Murphy, and Flannagan. The Examiner utilizes Asayama to show a method for actually reproducing acoustic characteristics of sound waves in an existing real space in which a wall space is divided into a plurality of areas which are virtual windows. (November 03 Office Action, page 14) However, the combination of Momii, Murphy, Flannagan and Asayama does not disclose a method including "adjusting a sound pressure to be reproduced in said second sound field so that the sound pressure present in said first sound field and the sound pressure to be reproduced in said second sound field assume a predetermined relationship, wherein the sound pressure present in said first sound field is used as a reference value in adjusting the sound pressure to be reproduced in said second sound field."

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 6, 11-13 and 18-19 distinguish over Momii in combination with Murphy, Flannagan and Asayama.

With respect to claim 20, the Shimauchi reference does not make up for the deficiencies of Momii and Murphy. The Examiner utilizes Shimauchi to show an apparatus for echo cancellation for a multi-channel teleconferencing system. (November 03 Office Action, page 16) However, the combination of Momii, Murphy and Shimauchi does not disclose a method including "adjusting a sound pressure to be reproduced in said second sound field so that the sound pressure present in said first sound field and the sound pressure to be reproduced in said second sound field assume a predetermined relationship, wherein the sound pressure present in said first sound field is used as a reference value in adjusting the sound pressure to be reproduced in said second sound field." Accordingly Applicants respectfully submit that claim 20 distinguishes over Momii in combination with Murphy and Shimauchi.

With respect to claim 21, the Miyahira reference does not make up for the deficiencies of Momii and Murphy. The Examiner utilizes Miyahira to show a wireless communication system. (November 03 Office Action, page 18) However, the combination of Momii, Murphy and Miyahira does not disclose a method including "adjusting a sound pressure to be reproduced in said second sound field so that the sound pressure present in said first sound field and the sound pressure to be reproduced in said second sound field assume a predetermined relationship, wherein the sound pressure present in said first sound field is used as a reference value in adjusting the sound pressure to be reproduced in said second sound field."

Accordingly Applicants respectfully submit that claim 21 distinguishes over Momii in combination with Murphy and Miyahira.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213)

488-7100 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance should the Examiner believe that such a telephone conference call would advance prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted, PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

Roger R. Wise

Registration No. 31,204

**Attorney For Applicants** 

Date: April 4, 2005

725 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2800 Los Angeles, CA 90017-5406

Telephone: (213) 488-7100 Facsimile: (213) 629-1033

18